

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,743	06/30/2003	Douglas E. Fain	S-92,821	2559
7590 11/17/2004			EXAMINER	
Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC East Tennessee Technology Park			MEEKS, TIMOTHY HOWARD	
ATTN: Robert M. Poteat, BLG. K-1037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 4699 Oak Ridge, TN 37831-7271			1762	
			DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004	,]

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		V
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summer	10/611,743	FAIN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Timothy H. Meeks	1762	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repuly lift NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a report of the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON the cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. 6 133)	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	—· s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matte		
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application	1.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		İ
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			i
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 June 2003</u> is/are: a		ted to by the Eveminer	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			1
		, ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
	difficient Note the attached	Office Action of form P10-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document		119(a)-(d) or (f).	
		10 or 54	1
2. Certified copies of the priority document			-
 Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau 		aceived in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		eceived	
The second of th	and sorting sopies flot it	Jocivou.	
httschmont(e)			
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	., .		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/611,743

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "and" at the end of line 4 should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Levy et al. (5,789,024).

The method as claimed disclosed in the abstract, col. 1, lines 17-28, col. 7, lines 15-30, and col. 9, lines 8-35. As to claim 8, the disclosure of heating in an evacuated vessel at col. 9 would accomplish drying of the membrane.

Claims 1-10, 16, 17, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Funke et al. (6,051,517).

Application/Control Number: 10/611,743

Art Unit: 1762

The claimed process is disclosed at col. 4, lines 20-50, col. 4, lines 60-68, col. 7, lines 10-15, 25-30, and 60-65, col. 8, lines 30-45, col. 9, lines 1-3 and 35-50, col. 10, lines 21-55 and col. 11, lines 34-38. Please note that the pore sizes disclosed in the examples after deposition of the layers are in the claimed ranges.

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by McMillan et al. (4,473,476).

The process is explicitly disclosed at the abstract and examples 1 and 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/611,743

Art Unit: 1762

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Funke et al. or McMillan et al.

The above references do not explicitly disclose coating only one side of the membrane, such as by placing the membrane on a holder. However, because the purpose of the membranes disclosed in the above references is to filter material which involves passing a medium through the membrane to allow some material to pass through based on the adjusted pore size and such passing through is only usually performed from a single direction through the filter to avoid dislodging trapped material filtered out by the membrane, it would have been obvious to coat only the inflow side of the filter to adjust the pore size thereof because that is the side at which filtration is performed and coating only one side would have the clear advantages of saving process time and cost by coating only one side as opposed to both sides.

Claims 11-13 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Funke et al in view of Levy et al.

Funke does not explicitly disclose a gamma alumina or alumina memebrane. However, because Lev discloses that it is desirable to decrease the pore size of alumina membranes by depositing inorganic compounds thereon (col. 7, line 23), it would have been obvious to have coated an alumna membrane by the process of Funke with a reasonable expectation that doing so would successfully provide an alumina membrane having an adjusted pore size to tailor its filtration properties.

Art Unit: 1762

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy H. Meeks whose telephone number is (571) 272-1423. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 6-6, T-Th 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P. Beck can be reached on (571) 272-1415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Timothy H Meeks Primary Examiner Art Unit 1762